

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-48 are pending in the present application. By this Reply, claims 35-48 have been added.

The specification has been amended to update the status of the related application.

#### **Double Patenting Rejection**

Claim 1 has been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claim 15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,086. Claims 2-4 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,086 as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Kashiwagi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,923,869). Claim 5 has been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 11 and 15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,086. Claim 6 has been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claim 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,086. Claims 7-9 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,086 as applied to claim 6 above and further in view of Kashiwagi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,923,869). Claim 10 has been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claim 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,086 as applied to claim 6 above and further in view of claim 11. Claim 11 has been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claim 15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,086. Claims 12-14 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claim 15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,086 as applied to claim 11 above and further in view of Kashiwagi et al. Claim 15 has been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 11 and 15 of U.S. Patent No.

6,553,086. Claims 16-17 and 19-20 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,086 in view of Kashiwagi et al. Claim 18 has been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,086 in view of Kashiwagi et al. as applied to claim 17 above and further in view of Kawamura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,075,920). Claims 21-22 and 24-25 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,086 as applied to claim 6 above and further in view of Kashiwagi et al. Claim 23 has been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,086 in view of Kashiwagi et al. as applied to claim 22 and further in view of Kawamura et al. Claims 26-27 and 29-30 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,086 in view of Kashiwagi et al. Claim 28 has been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,086 in view of Kashiwagi et al. as applied to claim 27 above and further in view of Kawamura et al. Claims 31, 32 and 34 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,086 in view of Kashiwagi et al. Claim 33 has been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,086 in view of Kashiwagi et al. as applied to claim 32 above and further in

view of Kawamura et al. These rejections, in so far as they pertain to the presently pending claims, are respectfully traversed.

Without acquiescing to any of the Examiner's allegations made in rejecting these claims, to expedite prosecution, a Terminal Disclaimer is hereby filed. Accordingly, all of the rejections have been overcome and the present application is in condition for allowance.

**New Claims**

Claims 35-48 are believed to be patentable over the applied art of record as being directed to similar features of the previous claims. Accordingly, indication of allowance of these new claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments, please contact Esther H. Chong, Reg. No. 40,953 at the offices of Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP.


Application No. 10/728,945  
Amendment dated December 5, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of September 6, 2005

Docket No.: 2950-0278P  
Page 16 of 16

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: December 5, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Esther H. Chong  
Registration No.: 40,953  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant

Enclosures: Terminal Disclaimer